

REMARKS

Claims 1-28, 30-38, and 40-47 are pending.

Claims 1-28, 30-38, and 40-47 stand rejected.

Claims 1, 11, 18, 22, 28, 38, and 43 have been amended.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 11-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 11 recites “each displayed classifier label is displayed only once in each displayed hierarchy.” The Office Action, p. 3, states that the recitation is not shown in the description. Applicants refer the Examiner to Figure 3 where each displayed classifier label is displayed only once, i.e. “Auto Parts”, “Delphi”, “Radios”, and “CD”.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 11, 18, 22, 28, 38, and 43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,154,750 to Roberge et al. (hereinafter “*Roberge*”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Roberge relates to “A method and system for navigating hierarchical database views that supports the efficient entry, review, and updating of data using a navigation display that is clear and efficient--yet compact in terms of the screen area used.” *Roberge*, Abstract.

Applicants respectfully submit that *Roberge* fails to teach or suggest:

multiple sub-node navigation bars oriented from the root node navigation bar, each sub-node navigation bar representing a sub-node from a selected level of the multiple hierarchy levels, wherein multiple sub-nodes represent database classifiers of database objects and a plurality of sub-nodes in the multiple hierarchy levels represent the same database classifier label having associated indexed, homogenous attributes of parts and each indexed, homogenous attribute

represents a heterogeneous section of the parts sliced across the attributes of the parts.

Page 8 of the Office Action cites Figures 7-19b as teaching the foregoing element of claim 1. However, a close inspection of *Roberge* reveals that many of the nodes referred to by the Office Action as representing the “database classifiers of database objects” in claim 1 are not database classifiers. Referring to Figures 1 and 4, *Roberge* teaches that the data under the “Echo” node in Figure 1 and elements 42 and 44 are not database classifiers but rather represent “echocardiographic reports”. *Roberge*, col. 3, lines 24-25. Since the only labels taught by *Roberge* that repeat are actual data and data reports not database classifier labels, Applicants respectfully submit that *Roberge* fails to teach or suggest “wherein multiple sub-nodes represent database classifiers of database objects and a plurality of sub-nodes in the multiple hierarchy levels represent the same database classifier label having associated indexed, homogenous attributes of parts and each indexed, homogenous attribute represents a heterogeneous section of the parts sliced across the attributes of the parts.”

Similarly, Applicants respectfully submit that *Roberge* fails to teach or suggest:

Claim 11 (emphasis added):

wherein multiple database classifier labels represent database objects and a plurality of database classifier labels in multiple hierarchy branches are the same database classifier label having associated indexed, homogenous attributes of parts and each indexed, homogenous attribute represents a heterogeneous section of the parts sliced across the attributes of the parts and each displayed classifier label is displayed only once in each displayed hierarchy;

Claim 18 (emphasis added):

a control interfaced with the database and the display, the control operable to generate a user interface for presentation on the display, the user interface having the root node and predetermined sub-nodes stacked from highest to lowest hierarchy levels, the user interface further operable to hide predetermined sub-nodes that are not relevant to the sub-node having the lowest hierarchy level, wherein multiple sub-nodes represent database classifiers of database objects, a plurality of sub-nodes in the multiple hierarchy levels are the same database classifier representing the same database object, and each displayed sub-node represents a distinct classifier.

Claim 22 (emphasis added):

wherein multiple sub-nodes represent database classifiers of database objects, and a plurality of sub-nodes in the multiple hierarchy levels are the same database classifier label having associated indexed, homogenous attributes of parts and each indexed, homogenous attribute represents a heterogeneous section of the parts sliced across the attributes of the parts, and each displayed sub-node represents a distinct classifier.

Claim 28 (emphasis added):

wherein multiple descendant nodes represent database classifiers of database objects, a plurality of descendant nodes in the multiple hierarchy levels represent the same database classifier label having associated indexed, homogenous attributes of parts and each indexed, homogenous attribute represents a heterogeneous section of the parts sliced across the attributes of the parts, and each displayed node represents a distinct classifier.

Claim 38 (emphasis added):

wherein multiple sibling nodes represent database classifiers of database objects, a plurality of sibling nodes in the hierarchy levels represent the same database classifier label having associated indexed, homogenous attributes of parts and each indexed, homogenous attribute represents a heterogeneous section of the parts sliced across the attributes of the parts, and the selected node, the ancestors of the selected node , and any children of the selected node represent distinct classifiers.

Claim 43 (emphasis added):

wherein multiple sibling nodes represent database classifiers of database objects, a plurality of sibling nodes in the hierarchy levels represent the same database classifier label having associated indexed, homogenous attributes of parts and each indexed, homogenous attribute represents a heterogeneous section of the parts sliced across the attributes of the parts.

In light of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 1, 11, 18, 22, 28, 38, and 43.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 11, 17-19, 22-28, 30-34, 37-38, 41-45 and 47 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guerrero-U.S. Patent No. 6,236,400 (referred to

herein as “*Guerrero*”) in view of Bernhardt et al.-U.S. Patent No. 6,496,208 (referred to herein as “*Bernhardt*”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Guerrero addresses a problem associated with the display of file hierarchies of file systems. Namely:

Computer operating systems store information in files on a storage medium that is accessible via a file system. A file system organizes the contents of a storage device such that a user can determine the contents of the storage device. To organize files, a file hierarchy is adopted by some operating systems' file systems. Existing operating systems are inefficient in the manner in which the file hierarchy is displayed for review. For example, existing operating systems continue to display information that is no longer relevant to the user. *Guerrero*, col. 1, lines 12-21.

Guerrero teaches that:

Embodiments of the invention provide a method and apparatus for controlling the display of hierarchical information. Hierarchical information is displayed efficiently such that information that is no longer needed is not displayed. There is no requirement that hierarchical levels through which the user has previously navigated be displayed. There is no need for the user to perform maintenance on the display to close expanded levels. Embodiments of the invention minimize the amount of display space that is wasted by prior art techniques. *Id.*, col. 3, lns. 38-47.

Bernhardt relates to a “method and apparatus for displaying and navigating data organized in the form of a graph structure (hierarchy or network).” *Bernhardt*, Abstract. *Bernhardt* further teaches that “[o]ne goal of the invention is to help a user to visualize the contents of the database once it has been classified by means of a classifier scheme such as the scheme disclosed in the above mentioned patent application to *Chaudhuri et al* [U.S. Patent No. 6,212,526] which is incorporated herein by reference.”

Applicants respectfully submit that *Guerrero* in combination with *Bernhardt* fails to teach or suggest “multiple sub-node navigation bars oriented from the root node navigation bar, each sub-node navigation bar representing a sub-node from a selected level of the multiple hierarchy levels, wherein multiple sub-nodes represent database classifiers of database objects and a plurality sub-nodes in the multiple hierarchy levels **represent the same database classifier label having associated indexed, homogenous attributes of parts and each**

indexed, homogenous attribute represents a heterogeneous section of the parts sliced across the attributes of the parts.” Claim 1 (emphasis added).

Bernhardt teaches that in the tree classifier disclosed in Chauduri et al. (U.S. Patent Application No. 08/982,760/U.S. Patent No. 6,212,526), “the nodes of the tree correspond to a classification system that can result in records having the same attribute satisfying different branches of the classifier tree.” *Bernhardt*, col. 7, lines 15-19. Thus, in Figures 4 and 5 of *Bernhardt*, classifiers, such as “Age” and “Total Per” are displayed at multiple levels within the same path.

In contrast to *Guerrero* in view of *Bernhardt*, the present invention demonstrates an easily discernible hierarchy that includes “associated indexed, homogenous attributes of parts” by reciting, in one embodiment, that “multiple sub-nodes represent database classifiers of database objects and a plurality of sub-nodes in the multiple hierarchy levels represent the same database classifier label having associated indexed, homogenous attributes of parts and each indexed, homogenous attribute represents a heterogeneous section of the parts sliced across the attributes of the parts.” Claim 1.

Similarly, Applicants respectfully submit that *Guerrero* in combination with *Bernhardt* fails to teach or suggest:

Claim 11 (emphasis added):

wherein multiple database classifier labels represent database objects and a plurality of database classifier labels in multiple hierarchy branches are the same database classifier label having associated indexed, homogenous attributes of parts and each indexed, homogenous attribute represents a heterogeneous section of the parts sliced across the attributes of the parts and each displayed classifier label is displayed only once in each displayed hierarchy;

Claim 18 (emphasis added):

a control interfaced with the database and the display, the control operable to generate a user interface for presentation on the display, the user interface having the root node and predetermined sub-nodes stacked from highest to lowest hierarchy levels, the user interface further operable to hide predetermined sub-nodes that are not relevant to the sub-node having the lowest hierarchy level, wherein multiple sub-nodes represent

database classifiers of database objects, a plurality of sub-nodes in the multiple hierarchy levels are the same database classifier representing the same database object, and each displayed sub-node represents a distinct classifier.

Claim 22 (emphasis added):

wherein multiple sub-nodes represent database classifiers of database objects, and a plurality of sub-nodes in the multiple hierarchy levels are the same database classifier label having associated indexed, homogenous attributes of parts and each indexed, homogenous attribute represents a heterogeneous section of the parts sliced across the attributes of the parts, and each displayed sub-node represents a distinct classifier.

Claim 28 (emphasis added):

wherein multiple descendant nodes represent database classifiers of database objects, a plurality of descendant nodes in the multiple hierarchy levels represent the same database classifier label having associated indexed, homogenous attributes of parts and each indexed, homogenous attribute represents a heterogeneous section of the parts sliced across the attributes of the parts, and each displayed node represents a distinct classifier.

Claim 38 (emphasis added):

wherein multiple sibling nodes represent database classifiers of database objects, a plurality of sibling nodes in the hierarchy levels represent the same database classifier label having associated indexed, homogenous attributes of parts and each indexed, homogenous attribute represents a heterogeneous section of the parts sliced across the attributes of the parts, and the selected node, the ancestors of the selected node , and any children of the selected node represent distinct classifiers.

Claim 43 (emphasis added):

wherein multiple sibling nodes represent database classifiers of database objects, a plurality of sibling nodes in the hierarchy levels represent the same database classifier label having associated indexed, homogenous attributes of parts and each indexed, homogenous attribute represents a heterogeneous section of the parts sliced across the attributes of the parts.

In light of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 1, 11, 18, 22, 28, 38, and 43. Applicant also respectfully

requests withdrawal of the rejection of the dependent claims for at least the same reasons as the independent claims upon which each indirectly or directly depends.

Claims 5, 8-10, 15 and 46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Guerrero* in view of *Bernhardt* and further in view of Chittu et al.-U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0107892 (hereinafter “*Chittu*”).

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Guerrero* in view of *Bernhardt* and further in view of Lindberg et al.-U.S. Patent No. 6,732,109 (hereinafter “*Lindberg*”).

Claims 3, 12-14, 20-21, 35-36 and 40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Guerrero* in view of *Bernhardt* and further in view of Janes et al.-U.S. Patent No. 6,642,946 (hereinafter “*Janes*”).

Claim 16 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Guerrero* in view of *Bernhardt* and further in view of *Janes* as applied to Claim 12, and further in view of *Chittu*.

The rejection of claims 3, 5, 7, 8-10, 12-14, 15, 16, 20-21, 35-36, 40, and 46 are respectfully, collectively traversed. Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 3, 5, 7, 8-10, 12-14, 15, 16, 20-21, 35-36, 40, and 46 are allowable for at least the same reasons as the independent claim upon which each directly or indirectly depends.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

FILED ELECTRONICALLY
October 1, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

/Kent B. Chambers/

Kent B. Chambers
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 38,839